

ASSIGNMENT No. 02

ENGLISH-II (6469) BS-LIS 4 YEARS

Spring, 2026

Q.1 Discuss Congress's attitude towards the creation of Pakistan. (20)

Central to the Congress stance was the ideal of *Akhand Bharat*, or Undivided India, which envisioned the subcontinent as an indivisible geopolitical entity. This concept was deeply rooted in the historical and cultural synthesis that Congress leaders believed had characterized India for centuries. They feared that accepting a separate Muslim state would set a dangerous precedent for future territorial fragmentation, thereby weakening the nation's standing on the global stage. This commitment to an undivided map made any negotiations regarding Pakistan's creation extremely contentious and fraught with suspicion. Congress leadership frequently dismissed the Muslim League's claims as exaggerated and maintained that any grievances the Muslims felt could be adequately addressed through constitutional guarantees within a single, federal, and democratic Indian union.

The Indian National Congress maintained a staunchly secular and unified vision of India, which stood in direct ideological opposition to the Muslim League's demand for a separate homeland. Congress leaders, including Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, consistently argued that India was a singular nation despite its religious diversity. They perceived the Two-Nation Theory, which formed the basis of the Pakistan movement, as a divisive construct that threatened the territorial integrity of the subcontinent. To Congress, the idea of partitioning the country along communal lines was not only politically unfeasible but also fundamentally against their nationalist ideals. Consequently, they resisted the demand for Pakistan at almost every legislative juncture, viewing it as an attempt to undermine the struggle for a united, independent, and secular India.

Initial Political Disdain

In the early stages of the movement, the Congress leadership often reacted to the demand for Pakistan with political disdain and intellectual dismissal. Figures like Nehru famously referred to the Pakistan demand as a "mad" scheme, believing that the Muslim League lacked the popular mandate to sustain such a radical political agenda. They believed that the masses were primarily concerned with socio-economic issues, such as poverty and colonial oppression, rather than communal separation. By framing the demand as an elitist pursuit by the League, Congress attempted to marginalize the political significance of the movement. This initial refusal to engage with the Muslim League as a representative body for all Indian Muslims significantly

deepened the political divide and fostered mutual mistrust between the two organizations.

Negotiation Stalemates

As the Pakistan movement gained undeniable momentum, the Congress was forced to engage in high-stakes negotiations, most notably during the Cripps Mission and the Cabinet Mission Plan. However, these attempts at compromise were frequently thwarted by differing interpretations of the proposed constitutional frameworks. The Congress insisted on a strong, centralized federal government, while the Muslim League sought maximum provincial autonomy to ensure the security of Muslim-majority areas. The failure to resolve these discrepancies led to intense deadlocks. Congress often felt that the League was being obstructive, while the League felt that Congress was attempting to impose "Hindu majoritarianism" under the guise of unity. These stalemates underscored the widening chasm between the two parties and made the prospect of a partitioned India increasingly inevitable.

The Communal Divide

The escalation of communal tensions during the 1940s further hardened the Congress attitude toward the creation of Pakistan. Widespread violence, such as the Direct Action Day, served to validate the fears of Congress leaders that a unified India might descend into civil war if the communal issue remained unresolved. However, rather than viewing the violence as an inevitability of partition, many Congress leaders blamed the League's agitation for creating a fractured society. The trauma of these communal riots forced Congress to eventually accept that their dream of *Akhand Bharat* was no longer tenable in the face of the massive popular demand for a separate state. This reluctant acceptance was less of a change in ideology and more a reaction to the deteriorating security environment.

The Role of Partition

While the Congress eventually agreed to the partition of India, their attitude remained one of deep sorrow and ideological regret. They viewed partition not as a fulfillment of political aspirations, but as a tragic necessity to escape the chaos of communal instability. Congress leaders often expressed the hope that the two nations might one day reconcile or even reunite, highlighting their inability to truly embrace the concept of a permanent division. Even as they signed the documents of transfer of power, the rhetoric of Congress remained fixed on the idea that the subcontinent had been artificially severed. This sentiment reflected a deep-seated belief that the unity of the subcontinent was a natural state that had been violently disrupted by political circumstances beyond their control.

Leadership Perspectives

The attitude of Congress was heavily influenced by its top leadership, particularly Gandhi, Nehru, and Patel. Gandhi, who had long advocated for Hindu-Muslim unity, was perhaps the most distraught by the prospect of partition, viewing it as a spiritual failure of his mission. Nehru, while equally opposed to the idea, was more focused on the modern, secular state he envisioned for India. Sardar Patel, on the other hand, eventually became the most pragmatic, realizing that a partitioned India might be more manageable than one plagued by the League's persistent obstructionism in a federal system. These differing perspectives among the top brass meant that the Congress response to the Pakistan demand was a complex blend of idealism, political pragmatism, and internal ideological struggle.

Negotiating with the British

Congress also engaged in a complex diplomatic dance with the British authorities regarding the creation of Pakistan. They repeatedly pressured the British to transfer power to the Congress as the successor state, arguing that the British were using the "divide and rule" policy to favor the Muslim League. Congress viewed any British willingness to discuss the Pakistan plan as a betrayal of their promise of Indian independence. This perception of British-League collusion fueled the Congress's opposition. They saw the creation of Pakistan as a colonial tool designed to leave behind a weak and fragmented subcontinent, which would ultimately be easier for the former imperial power to exert influence over, further complicating the already intense political negotiations during the final years of the Raj.

Post-Partition Relations

Even after the creation of Pakistan, the attitude of the Congress did not immediately shift to one of acceptance or cooperation. The immediate aftermath was marked by intense bitterness over border disputes, the integration of princely states, and the humanitarian crisis of mass migration. Congress leaders continued to criticize the two-nation theory, viewing the emergence of Pakistan as a constant challenge to their secular identity. They felt compelled to prove that India could thrive as a diverse democracy, often contrasting their model with what they perceived as the communal nature of the Pakistani state. This ongoing political and ideological rivalry ensured that the friction generated by the creation of Pakistan continued to define the foreign policy and domestic politics of both nations for decades.

The Impact on Minorities

A significant aspect of the Congress attitude was their concern for the millions of Muslims who would remain in India if Pakistan were created. They argued that a

separate state would put the remaining Muslim population in India at risk of communal suspicion, rendering their political situation precarious. Congress positioned itself as the true protector of India's minorities, claiming that the creation of a "Muslim" state would legitimize the idea of Hindu majoritarianism elsewhere. This perspective was used to frame the League as a force that was ultimately detrimental to the interests of the very people it claimed to represent. Congress utilized this argument extensively in their propaganda to discourage the demand for partition, emphasizing the long-term safety and rights of Muslims within a secular India.

Socio-Economic Factors

Congress also evaluated the demand for Pakistan through the lens of economic sustainability. They believed that the provinces that would comprise Pakistan—specifically the agrarian areas of the Punjab and Bengal—would not be economically viable as a standalone nation. They argued that the resources and industrial centers were concentrated in the rest of India and that the region would suffer without the support of the larger Indian economy. This argument was aimed at portraying the Pakistan movement as economically short-sighted and doomed to failure. By questioning the viability of the state, Congress hoped to convince the Muslim elite and the masses that their economic future was inextricably linked to the prosperity of an undivided and industrialized Indian subcontinental market under a central government.

The Role of Propaganda

Throughout the 1940s, the Congress utilized its extensive party network to conduct widespread propaganda against the idea of Pakistan. They organized public meetings, published newspapers, and mobilized volunteers to spread the message that the division of India would lead to the destruction of its heritage and future potential. This massive outreach was intended to counter the Muslim League's "Pakistan Zindabad" campaign. Congress successfully managed to hold onto the support of many nationalist Muslims, such as those in the Jamiat Ulema-e-Hind, who actively campaigned against partition. This highlighted that the Congress had deep ties within the Muslim community, which they used to challenge the League's claim of being the "sole spokesperson" for all Muslims in India and to undermine the movement's legitimacy.

The Impact of World War II

The global context of World War II played a significant role in shaping the Congress attitude. The Congress, through the "Quit India" movement, demanded immediate independence from British rule. The Muslim League, meanwhile, adopted a more cautious approach, which the Congress interpreted as a lack of commitment to freedom. This divergence in wartime strategy created immense friction. Congress

leaders were frustrated that the League's focus on the Pakistan issue seemed to take precedence over the collective goal of ending colonial rule. This frustration solidified the Congress's view of the League as an opportunistic political force that was willing to delay independence to secure its communal interests, creating a lasting legacy of resentment that complicated the eventual handover of power.

Legacy and Conclusion

Ultimately, the Congress's attitude toward the creation of Pakistan was defined by a profound and lasting conflict between their secular nationalist aspirations and the political reality of communal mobilization. The partition of India was a failure for the Congress in terms of its stated goal of maintaining a united nation, yet it became a defining moment in the establishment of the modern Indian state. The legacy of this opposition continues to influence how the movement is remembered in Indian historiography. Congress leaders often look back at the creation of Pakistan as a traumatic severance, viewing it as the unfortunate result of colonial machinations and the intransigence of the Muslim League, which permanently altered the political, cultural, and psychological landscape of the entire South Asian region.

Q.2 Describe the background of the Indian Independence Act of 1935? Also, analyze its salient features in detail. (20)

Historical Context

The Government of India Act 1935 was the result of a long and complex constitutional evolution, deeply rooted in the dissatisfaction with the previous reforms of 1919. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms had failed to satisfy the Indian demand for self-government, leading to widespread civil unrest and the rise of the nationalist movement. The British government, recognizing the need for a more comprehensive approach, appointed the Simon Commission in 1927 to review the working of the existing constitution. However, the commission's exclusion of Indian representatives sparked national outrage, leading to the Nehru Report of 1928. These events, followed by the landmark Round Table Conferences in London, paved the way for the British government to draft a new legislative framework that would attempt to reconcile Indian aspirations with imperial control.

The Simon Commission Failure

The Simon Commission, chaired by Sir John Simon, faced severe opposition in India due to its lack of Indian membership, which was seen as an insult to Indian political maturity. The boycott of the commission, accompanied by the slogan "Simon Go Back," signaled a turning point in the struggle for independence. The Congress and other political parties refused to cooperate, forcing the British to acknowledge that any future reforms would require a broader consensus. This failure highlighted the

growing chasm between the colonial rulers and the governed. It became clear that a mere amendment to existing laws would be insufficient, necessitating a complete re-evaluation of the administrative and political structures of India, which eventually culminated in the extensive and complex drafting process of the 1935 Act.

The Round Table Conferences

Between 1930 and 1932, three Round Table Conferences were held in London to discuss the constitutional future of India. These conferences brought together representatives from the Indian princely states, the Congress, the Muslim League, and other minority communities. While the conferences were marred by disagreements and the notable absence of the Congress in the first and third sessions, they were critical in defining the parameters for the 1935 Act. The discussions covered complex issues such as communal representation, federal structures, and the status of the princely states. These dialogues provided the raw material for the white paper published by the British government in 1933, which served as the blueprint for the final legislation, reflecting the arduous process of reaching a compromise.

The Communal Award

A pivotal background event was the Communal Award announced by Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald in 1932. This award provided for separate electorates for Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, and the "Depressed Classes" (Dalits). While intended to ensure minority representation, it was highly controversial and drew fierce opposition, particularly from Gandhi, who feared it would permanently divide the Hindu community. This led to the Poona Pact, which modified the award for the Depressed Classes. The complexities surrounding the Communal Award underscored the deep-seated communal mistrust that the 1935 Act had to navigate. The final legislation had to integrate these separate electorates into its broader constitutional framework, which ultimately entrenched communal divisions into the very architecture of Indian politics, a feature that would have profound long-term consequences.

Salient Features: Federal Structure

The most significant feature of the 1935 Act was its proposal for an All-India Federation. This federation was to comprise both British India and the princely states, aiming to integrate the two into a single constitutional unit. The central government would be responsible for key areas like defense, foreign policy, and currency, while the provinces would have autonomy over regional governance. However, the federal part of the Act was never fully implemented because the princely states refused to join the federation, citing concerns over their autonomy. Despite this, the federal scheme remains a cornerstone of the Act, demonstrating the British ambition to

create a unified, centrally governed structure that could maintain stability while slowly transitioning toward a form of self-government under imperial supervision.

Provincial Autonomy

The 1935 Act introduced a system of provincial autonomy, marking a significant shift from the previous dyarchy system. It abolished dyarchy in the provinces, granting the elected provincial governments control over all departments, including education, health, and law and order. This change allowed Indians, for the first time, to hold significant executive power within their provinces. This empowerment led to the 1937 elections, in which the Congress achieved substantial victories, forming governments in a majority of provinces. This development was crucial, as it allowed Indian politicians to gain practical experience in governance, a necessary step toward the eventual full independence of the country, and fostered the growth of political institutions that would eventually serve as the foundation of the post-independence Indian state.

Division of Powers

The Act established a clear division of legislative powers between the center and the provinces, categorized into three distinct lists: the Federal List, the Provincial List, and the Concurrent List. This mechanism was designed to provide a stable regulatory environment and to minimize jurisdictional disputes. The Federal List included subjects of national importance like the military and international trade; the Provincial List dealt with local matters; and the Concurrent List contained subjects where both levels of government could legislate, with the center having authority in the event of a conflict. This tri-partite division of powers was so comprehensive and well-structured that it served as the direct template for the division of powers in the modern Indian Constitution, reflecting its long-term significance.

Central Executive and Legislature

At the center, the Act maintained the imperial grip through a system of "dyarchy" at the federal level. While the legislature was expanded, the Governor-General retained significant powers, including control over reserved subjects like defense and foreign affairs. The central legislature was made bicameral, consisting of the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly, both with increased Indian representation. However, the presence of nominated members, especially from the princely states, meant that the democratic process was still heavily constrained by the colonial authority. This structural design reflected the British government's desire to allow Indian participation in governance while ensuring that the ultimate control over the empire remained firmly in the hands of the British administration, limiting the true exercise of political sovereignty.

The Reserve Bank of India

A critical administrative feature of the 1935 Act was the establishment of the Reserve Bank of India (RBI). This move was intended to centralize the management of currency and credit in the country, providing a degree of economic stability that had previously been lacking. The creation of the RBI was part of the broader effort to modernize India's institutional framework. By formalizing financial oversight, the British government aimed to ensure that the Indian economy was better integrated into the global monetary system. The establishment of the RBI is still viewed today as a foundational achievement of the 1935 Act, as it provided the institutional mechanism necessary for the nation's economic management, demonstrating the enduring impact of the Act's administrative reforms on India's future.

The Federal Court

The Act also provided for the creation of a Federal Court, which was established in 1937 to settle disputes between the central government and the provinces, or between the provinces themselves. This court acted as a precursor to the modern Supreme Court of India. It was responsible for interpreting the constitutional laws and ensuring that the federal structure functioned properly. By providing an independent judicial authority, the Act aimed to foster confidence in the legal system and to provide a peaceful mechanism for conflict resolution. The Federal Court's existence underscored the shift toward a more formalized legal and constitutional culture, which was an essential component in preparing India for its eventual transition into a sovereign democratic republic under the rule of law.

Communal Representation Extended

The 1935 Act further entrenched the system of communal representation that had been introduced in 1909 and expanded in 1919. It extended separate electorates not only to Muslims but also to Sikhs, Christians, Europeans, and Anglo-Indians. This policy of "divide and rule" was seen by many nationalists as a calculated move to prevent a unified Indian identity. By creating separate voting blocs based on religious and communal identities, the Act reinforced the differences between communities rather than bridging them. This aspect of the legislation is heavily criticized in historical analysis as a significant contributing factor to the communalization of Indian politics, eventually making the partition of the subcontinent in 1947 appear as an almost inevitable conclusion to the colonial era.

Legislative Scope and Complexity

The 1935 Act was the longest and most complex piece of legislation passed by the British Parliament to date. Its sheer volume and detail reflected the British government's attempt to cover every possible administrative, judicial, and legislative

contingency. This complexity was both a strength and a weakness; while it provided a comprehensive framework, it was also criticized for being rigid and overly restrictive. The act was so elaborate that it essentially left no room for Indian political evolution beyond the parameters set by the British. This rigidity was a point of contention for Indian leaders, who felt that the law was designed to stifle rather than nurture their capacity for independent governance and full self-rule during the critical final decade of the Raj.

Critical Evaluation

Critically, the 1935 Act was a hybrid of reform and repression. It offered a significant degree of democratic participation and administrative autonomy, which provided Indian leaders with the necessary experience to run a country. At the same time, it ensured that the core of the imperial power remained untouched, with the Governor-General wielding near-total control over vital national security and economic policies. Jawaharlal Nehru famously called the Act a "charter of slavery," reflecting the widespread frustration with the limited nature of the reforms. However, in retrospect, the Act's institutional framework provided the vital groundwork for the modern Indian state, serving as the skeletal structure upon which the post-independence leaders would build their democratic, federal, and constitutional institutions after 1947.

Conclusion and Legacy

In conclusion, the Government of India Act 1935 was a landmark piece of legislation that represented the culmination of years of imperial maneuvering and political struggle. While it failed to grant true independence and was ultimately rejected by all major Indian parties, its importance cannot be overstated. By creating a federal system, empowering provincial governments, and establishing the key pillars of a modern state—such as the central bank and a federal court—it created the architecture for governance that would survive the transition to freedom. The Act remains a testament to the complex legacy of British rule, having provided the very tools that India's founding fathers would eventually use to create a sovereign and independent nation, albeit in a truncated and partitioned form.

Q.3 The Pakistan Resolution was passed in the annual Session of the Muslim League. (20)

Setting the Stage

The annual session of the All-India Muslim League, held in Lahore in March 1940, stands as the most critical turning point in the history of the Pakistan movement. The atmosphere in India was electric, characterized by rising political tensions between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. Following the outbreak of World War II, the British government had begun to look for ways to manage the political

future of the subcontinent, and the League sought to capitalize on this opportunity. The session was intended to demonstrate the growing unity and resolve of Indian Muslims, who were becoming increasingly disillusioned with the prospect of living under a permanent Congress-dominated majority. This gathering was the platform where the demand for a separate Muslim homeland was formally articulated.

The Lahore Session

The Lahore session took place at Minto Park, drawing thousands of delegates from across the British Indian provinces. The enthusiasm was palpable, with leaders like Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah arriving to a hero's welcome. This was not merely another political conference; it was a manifestation of the collective consciousness of a community that felt its distinct cultural, religious, and political identity was under threat. The leadership of the League, having been sidelined by the Congress's recent electoral successes in the 1937 provincial elections, utilized this session to reclaim their political space. The focus was entirely on establishing a new direction for the future of Indian Muslims, ensuring their survival and empowerment within a constitutional framework that respected their status as a separate nation.

The Drafting of the Resolution

The resolution, which came to be known as the Pakistan Resolution, was drafted through intense deliberations among the top leaders of the Muslim League, including Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan and Fazlul Haq. The document was carefully worded to ensure that it was both clear in its objective and politically strategic in its reach. It aimed to address the concerns of the Muslim-majority provinces while also providing a sense of security to Muslims living in minority areas. The drafting process was a testament to the organizational capability of the League at the time, reflecting a unified effort to translate the long-standing grievances of the Muslim community into a concrete, actionable, and legally sound political demand that would be difficult for the British government to ignore.

The Core Demand

The core of the resolution was the call for the grouping of Muslim-majority areas in the northwestern and eastern parts of India into "independent states." This phrasing was highly significant, as it emphasized the sovereignty of these regions rather than mere provincial autonomy. By calling for independent states, the resolution effectively shattered the myth of a unified Indian nation. It asserted that Muslims were a separate nation, with their own culture, history, and destiny. This was a radical departure from previous attempts at constitutional compromise. The resolution stated that the constitutional plan for India would not be acceptable to the Muslims unless it was designed in such a way that these areas were autonomous and sovereign, setting a firm standard for future negotiations.

Jinnah's Leadership

Muhammad Ali Jinnah's address at the Lahore session was the highlight of the event, where he passionately articulated the Two-Nation Theory. He argued that Hinduism and Islam were not mere religions but distinct social orders, and that the attempt to force them into a single political system would only lead to internal strife. His ability to lead the League through this transformative moment was unmatched. He transformed the League from an elitist organization into a truly mass movement, giving voice to the aspirations of the common Muslim. His leadership during the session ensured that the demand for Pakistan was not seen as a bargaining chip for better terms within a federation, but as an absolute, non-negotiable goal for the future of the Muslims of India.

The Reception by the Public

The resolution was met with overwhelming support from the Muslim public, who saw it as a ray of hope after years of political insecurity. The news of the resolution spread rapidly across the country, energizing students, laborers, and the professional classes alike. It gave the Muslim movement a central purpose and a common symbol around which to rally. The psychological impact of the resolution was profound; it gave the Muslims of India a sense of identity and direction that had been lacking. For the first time, the demand for a separate state was not just an intellectual idea but a national cause. This widespread enthusiasm was the primary reason the League was able to successfully organize the movement in the following years.

Opposition from Congress

The Indian National Congress, however, was outraged by the passage of the resolution. They dismissed it as a reactionary and communal demand that served the interests of the British colonial government's "divide and rule" strategy. Congress leaders, including Gandhi and Nehru, publicly criticized the resolution, claiming it would lead to the ruin of the subcontinent. They argued that a separate state would be economically unviable and that it was a betrayal of the common struggle for independence. The tension between the League and Congress reached a new height following the Lahore session, as the two parties were now operating from completely different, and fundamentally incompatible, visions for the political structure of a post-colonial India.

The British Reaction

The British authorities, meanwhile, adopted a calculated stance toward the resolution. They recognized the rising influence of the Muslim League and were increasingly reliant on their cooperation for wartime efforts. While they did not immediately endorse the demand for Pakistan, they acknowledged it as a significant development

that had to be reckoned with. The British saw the resolution as a way to balance the demands of the Congress, ensuring that no single party could dictate the terms of the constitutional future of India. This neutral, albeit opportunistic, stance by the British allowed the League to build its political legitimacy and effectively negotiate as an equal player, setting the stage for the final transfer of power in 1947.

International Implications

The passage of the resolution also had international implications, as the struggle for independence was being watched by the global community during the ongoing war. The demand for Pakistan caught the attention of international media and policy experts, who began to recognize that the political future of India was far more complex than just a movement for freedom from British rule. The League effectively used this international attention to build its case, highlighting that the demand for Pakistan was a matter of rights for a distinct nation. This helped in softening the narrative that the movement was purely reactionary, framing it instead as a democratic pursuit of self-determination for a significant portion of the Indian population.

Organizational Consolidation

Following the Lahore session, the Muslim League began an intensive process of organizational consolidation. Committees were formed, provincial branches were strengthened, and the message of the Pakistan Resolution was disseminated to every corner of India. The session had provided the necessary momentum to professionalize the party's operations. The youth wing, the student associations, and the labor unions became active contributors to the cause. This organizational expansion was crucial in ensuring that the demand for Pakistan reached the rural areas, where the majority of the Muslim population resided. The resolution had provided a clear roadmap, and the League's leadership ensured that this roadmap was followed with unwavering discipline, making the movement an unstoppable political force.

Cultural and Religious Mobilization

The resolution also served as a catalyst for cultural and religious mobilization. It emphasized the need to protect Muslim culture, language, and religion from being assimilated into the majority culture. This resonated deeply with the Muslim intelligentsia, who were concerned about the dilution of their identity. The Lahore session became a symbol of this cultural consciousness. It inspired poets, writers, and journalists to write extensively about the need for a separate state, creating a vibrant literary movement that supported the political cause. This mobilization proved that the Pakistan movement was not just a political struggle but a deep-seated desire

to preserve a unique identity, which was seen as the most vital asset for the future generations of Indian Muslims.

The Role of the Youth

The youth played an indispensable role in the success of the Pakistan movement following the Lahore session. Student wings of the Muslim League, particularly in universities like Aligarh Muslim University, became the vanguard of the campaign. They traveled across India, educating people about the resolution and the importance of Pakistan. Their passion and energy were instrumental in convincing the older generation that the movement was both necessary and achievable. The youth provided the logistical support and the propaganda machine that allowed the League to effectively counter the Congress's narrative. The Lahore session had captured their imagination, and they remained committed to the vision of a sovereign state, eventually becoming the leaders of the new nation after 1947.

The Economic Vision

Although the resolution was primarily a political document, it also hinted at the economic aspirations of the Muslims. It argued that the resources of the Muslim-majority areas were being exploited and that a separate state would allow for the equitable distribution of wealth and development. This vision of economic justice was a powerful tool for the League to win over the support of the impoverished sections of the society. By promising that Pakistan would be a land of opportunity and prosperity, the League effectively framed the political struggle as an economic necessity. This economic perspective, while not fully developed at the time, remained a critical component of the movement's rhetoric, making the prospect of Pakistan an attractive goal.

The Enduring Legacy

In conclusion, the passage of the Pakistan Resolution in the 1940 Lahore session was the defining moment that set the Muslim League on an irreversible path toward the creation of a sovereign state. It provided the clear objective, the moral justification, and the organizational framework that were necessary to mobilize millions of Muslims. The legacy of this event is evident in the birth of Pakistan, which fundamentally altered the geography and politics of the subcontinent. The Lahore session remains the most significant milestone in the history of the movement, serving as a reminder of the power of collective resolve, visionary leadership, and the quest for political sovereignty. The resolution was the spark that ignited the struggle, transforming a political dream into a historic reality.

Q.4 In the summer of 1945, the party came into power in the United Kingdom. (20)

The Labour Party Victory

In the summer of 1945, the British Labour Party, led by Clement Attlee, won a landslide victory in the United Kingdom's general election, replacing Winston Churchill's Conservative government. This political shift was profound, not just for domestic policies, but for the future of the British Empire, including India. The Labour Party had long been more sympathetic to the cause of Indian independence than the Conservatives, who were deeply attached to the imperial project. The victory of the Labour Party marked the beginning of a rapid reassessment of British involvement in India. They were burdened by a war-ravaged economy and domestic social pressures, making the continued maintenance of a vast, unruly empire an increasingly expensive and politically unsustainable commitment that the new government was eager to resolve.

Post-War Realities

The Labour Party came to power at a time when Britain was economically exhausted from the Second World War. The empire was no longer the asset it had once been; it was a drain on scarce resources that were desperately needed for rebuilding Britain's own infrastructure and establishing the social welfare state that the Labour Party had promised. Attlee's government recognized that maintaining control over India through force was no longer a viable option, given the rising tide of nationalism and the military's own exhaustion after years of global conflict. The reality of the post-war world necessitated a pragmatic and often hurried approach to the "Indian question," which became the top priority for the new government as they sought to liquidate their imperial liabilities.

The Call for Elections

One of the first major actions taken by the Labour government regarding India was the announcement of fresh elections for the central and provincial assemblies. This was done to clarify the political situation on the ground, which had remained stagnant during the war years. The elections were crucial for determining the representational strength of the two main political parties: the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League. The Labour government hoped that the election results would provide a clear mandate that would facilitate the constitutional negotiations they planned to initiate. However, the elections instead demonstrated the deep polarization of the country, as the Congress and the League swept their respective constituencies, making a consensus-based transfer of power look increasingly difficult to achieve.

The Cabinet Mission

To address the growing stalemate, the Labour government dispatched the Cabinet Mission to India in early 1946. This mission, consisting of three senior cabinet members, was tasked with negotiating a constitutional settlement that would keep India united while accommodating the concerns of the Muslim League. The mission proposed a complex three-tier federal structure, which was an attempt to balance the competing visions of a strong central government and decentralized regional autonomy. The failure of this mission to gain lasting support from both parties was a pivotal failure. The Labour government's willingness to send high-level ministers illustrated their urgency in resolving the issue, but the entrenched positions of the political actors in India ultimately rendered their diplomatic efforts ineffective in preventing the eventual partition.

The Shift in Tone

The tone of the British government's communication with Indian leaders shifted significantly after 1945. There was a marked move toward recognizing the inevitability of Indian independence. Labour leaders spoke in terms of "transfer of power" rather than "granting reforms," a symbolic change that acknowledged the changing status of the relationship between Britain and India. This shift encouraged the Indian leadership to take a more assertive stance in their negotiations, knowing that the British were looking for an exit strategy. The shift also signaled to the international community that the era of British imperialism was coming to a close. For the Muslim League and the Congress, this new approach by the Labour government created a sense of urgency, as both sides hurried to secure their interests.

Lord Mountbatten's Appointment

The climax of the Labour government's Indian policy was the appointment of Lord Louis Mountbatten as the last Viceroy of India in early 1947. Mountbatten was given a clear mandate by Attlee to oversee the transfer of power as quickly as possible. His arrival signaled the end of the long-drawn-out negotiations and the start of a final, swift resolution to the crisis. Mountbatten's energetic, and some would say impatient, style accelerated the process of partition. He engaged in intensive rounds of discussions with Jinnah, Nehru, and other leaders, ultimately deciding that partition was the only way forward. His actions were a direct reflection of the Labour government's desire to terminate their responsibility in India, even if it meant accepting a truncated and fractured final settlement.

The Partition Decision

The Labour government's acceptance of the partition plan was a reluctant conclusion to a process that they had initially hoped would result in a united India. The communal violence that had engulfed the country, combined with the total breakdown of trust between the Congress and the League, left Mountbatten and the

Attlee administration with few alternatives. The decision to partition was formalized in the June 3rd Plan. By this point, the Labour government was more concerned with a swift withdrawal to avoid becoming further entangled in the communal bloodshed than with the long-term political viability of the successor states. Their primary goal had evolved from establishing a sustainable constitutional framework to executing a clean, albeit painful, break from their imperial obligations.

Economic Pressures

The economic strain of 1945 in Britain cannot be overemphasized. The Labour government was operating under massive debt to the United States and faced the daunting challenge of transitioning from a war to a peace economy. The British taxpayers were tired of subsidizing imperial adventures. This financial reality forced the Labour government to be much more pragmatic than any previous administration. They understood that every month spent in India was a month of financial drain. This economic necessity acted as a major catalyst for the decision to speed up the timeline for the withdrawal. The political goal of decolonization aligned perfectly with the economic goal of fiscal consolidation, making the Labour government the most effective agent for the end of the Raj.

Domestic Politics

Within the United Kingdom, the Labour government faced pressure from both the left and the right regarding the Indian situation. The left-wing of the party was ideologically committed to decolonization, while the right-wing and the Conservatives were more cautious about the loss of prestige and influence. Attlee, a steady and decisive leader, managed these internal tensions by maintaining a focus on the practical necessity of withdrawal. His government's success in managing these internal political pressures allowed them to remain focused on the goal of transfer of power. They were able to frame the independence of India as a fulfillment of Labour's long-standing moral obligation, while simultaneously managing the fallout from the loss of imperial control with a degree of diplomatic pragmatism.

The Role of the Civil Service

The British Civil Service, both in London and in India, played a critical role in executing the Labour government's vision. They were responsible for the complex logistics of withdrawing administration, distributing assets, and finalizing borders. The task was monumental, and the speed with which it was carried out under the Labour government's directives placed enormous pressure on the administrative system. The success of this withdrawal, despite the surrounding chaos of communal riots, is a testament to the organizational capability of the colonial bureaucracy. While the administrative side of the transfer was relatively efficient, the political and

humanitarian consequences of the hurried withdrawal were profound, highlighting the limitations of an administration that was driven by the urgent need for a quick exit.

International Relations

The Labour government's decision on India also had to be considered in the context of the emerging Cold War. Britain wanted to maintain a degree of influence in South Asia even after withdrawal, hoping that both India and Pakistan would remain within the Commonwealth and serve as strategic partners. This objective influenced their negotiations, as they sought to ensure that the transition did not create a complete power vacuum that could be exploited by other global actors, particularly the Soviet Union. The desire to maintain a strategic footprint in the region was a secondary but persistent factor in the Labour government's approach, adding another layer of complexity to their already difficult task of balancing domestic pressures, imperial obligations, and regional instability.

The Psychological Shift

There was a profound psychological shift in the British ruling class after 1945. The war had changed the way people viewed Britain's role in the world. The traditional narrative of the "civilizing mission" was replaced by a more sober assessment of Britain's own limitations. The Labour government's victory and the subsequent move to independence for India represented this new, more realistic understanding. It was a recognition that the world had changed and that Britain had to change with it. This shift was not easy, and it was met with resistance from those who were still attached to the idea of imperial grandeur, but it was essential for the successful transition of the nation toward its post-imperial reality as a medium-sized European power.

Humanitarian Considerations

The Labour government was deeply affected by the reports of violence and the unfolding humanitarian crisis in India as the partition plan was implemented. The scale of the displacement and the loss of life was greater than anything the government had anticipated. While they may have expected unrest, the depth of the communal tragedy caught them off guard. This crisis created a moral burden for the Labour government, who had promised a peaceful transfer of power. Although they tried to maintain order, their resources were limited, and their commitment to exiting quickly prevented any significant intervention. This memory of the chaotic withdrawal remained a controversial aspect of the Labour government's legacy, sparking ongoing debate about the effectiveness of their policies.

Conclusion and Legacy

The victory of the Labour Party in 1945 was the single most decisive factor in the timing and nature of India's independence. By prioritizing domestic recovery and

fiscal reality over imperial prestige, the Labour government ensured that the colonial era would come to a swift, though ultimately traumatic, end. Their pragmatic approach toward the transfer of power, while not without its flaws, successfully navigated the end of the British Raj and laid the foundation for the contemporary relationship between Britain and the two successor states of India and Pakistan. The Labour government's legacy is defined by this act of decolonization, which transformed the international order and concluded one of the most significant chapters in the history of the modern world.

Q.5 Make a list of the injustices of the Radcliffe Award with Pakistan? (20)

The Boundary Commission

The Radcliffe Award, named after the British barrister Sir Cyril Radcliffe, was the mechanism responsible for drawing the borders between India and Pakistan in 1947. Given only a few weeks to complete the gargantuan task of dividing two massive provinces—the Punjab and Bengal—Radcliffe was faced with an impossible deadline and limited local knowledge. The resulting boundaries were a source of immediate and lasting grievance for Pakistan. The process was marred by a lack of transparency, hasty decision-making, and significant geographical anomalies that many in Pakistan viewed as biased toward India. The final award, published just after independence, left deep scars on the relationship between the two nations, setting the stage for decades of territorial disputes and geopolitical friction that persist even today.

Awarding Gurdaspur to India

One of the most contentious decisions of the Radcliffe Award was the inclusion of the Gurdaspur district in India rather than Pakistan. Gurdaspur was a Muslim-majority district, and its transfer to India was critical because it provided a land bridge to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Without Gurdaspur, India would not have had direct land access to Kashmir. Pakistanis have long argued that this decision was a calculated move by the British to ensure that Kashmir would remain within India's sphere of influence. This action is widely regarded in Pakistan as one of the most egregious injustices of the partition, as it permanently altered the demographic and geopolitical landscape of the region, significantly influencing the subsequent and long-standing Kashmir conflict.

Disruption of Irrigation Systems

The Radcliffe Award severely disrupted the integrated irrigation system of the Punjab, which had been designed as a single unit during the colonial era. By drawing the border across the rivers and canals, the award placed the headworks of several vital irrigation channels in Indian territory, while the lands they were intended to water

ended up in Pakistan. This gave India the strategic leverage to control the flow of water, a fact that would lead to significant water disputes in the years following independence. The division did not take into account the hydrological unity of the region, showing a complete disregard for the agricultural livelihood of the millions of farmers who depended on this complex, interlinked water network for their survival.

Division of Ferozepur and Zira

In the Punjab, the tehsils of Ferozepur and Zira, which had significant Muslim populations, were also awarded to India, despite expectations that they would go to Pakistan. These areas were strategically important due to the presence of critical canal headworks. The inclusion of these areas in India was seen by Pakistan as a blatant violation of the principles set for the partition, which were supposed to be based on the population demographics of the regions. The transfer of these tehsils not only deprived Pakistan of valuable agricultural land but also stripped it of essential infrastructure, leaving the newly formed state in a position of immediate economic and strategic vulnerability, further fostering the perception of a deliberate anti-Pakistan bias in the boundary commission's work.

Impact on Chittagong Hill Tracts

In Bengal, the award of the Chittagong Hill Tracts to India—initially, and then their subsequent integration into East Pakistan—was another source of frustration. Although the region had an overwhelming non-Muslim population, it was historically and economically connected to the Chittagong region of East Bengal. The award initially assigned these tracts to India, which would have essentially cut off the Chittagong port from its hinterland. While the boundary was eventually adjusted, the confusion and the initial ruling demonstrated the lack of care and geographic understanding that characterized the work of the Radcliffe Commission. This incident reinforced the Pakistani belief that the commission was operating with little concern for the regional economic realities or the long-term sustainability of the new states.

Neglect of Population Exchange

The Radcliffe Award did not adequately account for the massive population displacements that were already occurring on the ground. By drawing lines that cut through villages and districts, the award ignored the social and communal reality of the people living in those border areas. It failed to provide any mechanism for the safe movement of the millions who were being forced out of their homes. Pakistanis argue that the award exacerbated the scale of the human tragedy by failing to align the borders with the actual patterns of settlement. The commission acted as if it were drawing lines on an empty map, ignoring the complex, centuries-old social fabric of the Punjab and Bengal, which was torn apart by the stroke of a pen.

Strategic Vulnerability

The boundaries drawn by Radcliffe left Pakistan with a geographically fragmented state, separated by thousands of miles of Indian territory, and a western border that was strategically difficult to defend. The award left major urban centers and vital communication lines close to the border, making Pakistan constantly vulnerable to military threats. In the view of Pakistani policymakers, this was not a coincidence but a deliberate attempt to handicap the new state from its very inception. The borders were seen as inherently unstable, designed to keep Pakistan in a state of perpetual insecurity, which forced the country to prioritize military expenditures over economic development, a path that has significantly shaped Pakistan's domestic policy and national priorities since 1947.

Lack of Due Process

The lack of due process in the Radcliffe Commission's work is a fundamental injustice frequently cited by Pakistani historians. Radcliffe arrived in India with no prior experience in the subcontinent and completed his work in a remarkably short period. The commission operated in secrecy, and there was little opportunity for stakeholders to voice their concerns or provide evidence to justify their claims. This lack of transparency meant that the final decisions were arbitrary and based on limited information. The rushed nature of the process served the British government's desire for a quick exit but did so at the expense of justice, stability, and the long-term welfare of the millions of people whose lives would be permanently altered by the new borders.

The Bias of the Maps

The maps used by the commission were often outdated and did not reflect the actual population demographics at the time. This reliance on poor data led to errors that had devastating consequences for the affected regions. Pakistanis have often pointed to the discrepancies between the official data and the final border decisions as evidence of a systemic bias against the Muslim-majority areas. Even when the data clearly showed a Muslim majority in a particular district, the commission often opted to award the territory to India based on other, less transparent factors. This perceived bias fueled the belief that the award was not an impartial judicial act, but a political tool wielded to weaken Pakistan and ensure a favorable outcome for the Indian state.

Political Manipulation

Many in Pakistan believe that the Radcliffe Award was the result of political manipulation, where the British were influenced by the lobbying of the Indian National Congress. They argue that leaders like Nehru used their close personal and political ties with the British leadership, including Mountbatten, to lobby for specific

borders that would serve India's interests. The exclusion of Muslim League representatives from meaningful consultation on the border details is seen as proof of this manipulation. The perception that the process was rigged against Pakistan was immediate and has remained a core component of the historical narrative in Pakistan regarding the partition. It turned the boundary commission into a symbol of imperial injustice that, in the eyes of many, delegitimized the entire partition process.

Socio-Economic Dislocation

The Radcliffe Award caused immense socio-economic dislocation by severing established economic ties. Market towns were separated from their rural hinterlands, and industrial units in one region were cut off from their supply chains in another. This division had a devastating impact on the economic vitality of the newly formed regions of Pakistan. It required the new state to essentially build an economy from scratch in the middle of a humanitarian crisis. Pakistanis view this as a form of economic warfare, where the border was drawn to maximize the harm to the new nation. The loss of wealth, land, and established businesses caused by the award created a sense of grievance that became deeply embedded in the national consciousness of Pakistan.

Cultural and Religious Sensitivity

The award showed a blatant disregard for the cultural and religious sensitivity of the people. It placed historical sites, shrines, and communities in a way that often violated the cultural continuity of the region. Many areas of deep religious significance to the Muslims were left on the Indian side, while large, long-standing communities were forced to abandon their ancestral lands. This disregard for the cultural geography of the subcontinent added a personal dimension to the injustice of the award. For the individuals involved, the border was not just a political line but an existential threat that forced them to choose between their faith and their homes, leaving a legacy of bitterness that continues to inform Pakistan's perspective on the partition.

Lack of Follow-up Mechanisms

The Radcliffe Award was final and binding, but it lacked any mechanism for appeal or review, even when obvious errors were identified in the mapping. This finality, combined with the lack of transparency, made it impossible to correct even the most egregious mistakes. Pakistan's repeated requests for a reassessment were rejected, leaving the nation with a border that it felt was both unjust and practically unworkable. This rigidity of the award ensured that the disputes created in 1947 would remain unresolved, acting as a permanent source of friction between the two neighbors. The refusal to provide any forum for addressing the grievances regarding

the border only served to confirm the Pakistani belief that the commission's decisions were intentionally harmful and beyond the reach of rational negotiation.

Legacy and Conclusion

In conclusion, the Radcliffe Award is remembered in Pakistan as a quintessential injustice of the partition era. It is seen as a rushed, biased, and poorly conceived piece of work that ignored geographic reality, demographic data, and the human suffering of millions. The award fundamentally disadvantaged Pakistan from its first day of independence, creating a lasting legacy of strategic vulnerability and economic dislocation. The grievances related to Gurdaspur, the irrigation systems, and the arbitrary nature of the border remain central to Pakistan's historical identity and its regional foreign policy. The Radcliffe Award stands as a harsh reminder of how the arbitrary decisions of an departing colonial power can create, and sustain, conflict in a region for generations to come.

Download free Solved Assignments of Pakistan
Solvedassignmentsaioou.com
+92334-5504551
+92300-5752486